Mr. K. S. Raghavan *(Secretary to Government):* I have not got the figure.

മിസ്റ്റർ പി. ടി. ജേക്കബ്ബ്: കൊച്ചി, ഹാർബർ മുതലായ സ്ഥലങ്ങളിൽനിന്നു പല ജോലിക്കാരേയും പിരിച്ചുവിട്ടിട്ടുണ്ട്. അവരേയും മിലിട്ടറി സ്പെഷ്സനലിൽ പെടുത്തുമോ?

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. എസ്സ്. രാഘവൻ: അവരിൽ മിലിട്ടറി വർക്സ്സിൽ പെട്ടിരുന്നവരെ മാത്രം പ്പെടുത്തണമെന്നുള്ളേശിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്.

Demand put and carried

12. 1-Land Revenue—4-Features—Petrol and Accessories

Rao Sahib A. Madhava Prabhu *(Diwan Peishkar):* I rise to move for an additional allotment of Rs. 1,328 under "1-Land Revenue—4-Fisheries—Petrol and Accessories".

The maintenance charges of the Fishery Boat for the years 1118 and 1119 have to be adjusted to the credit of the Public Works Department. An amount of Rs. 1,322—11—4 remains to be so adjusted to that Department. There is no provision in the Budget of 1121 for meeting this item of expenditure nor are savings anticipated under other heads for transfer. Therefore an additional allotment of Rs. 1,328 is required under "1-Land Revenue—4-Fisheries—Petrol and Accessories".

I request that the amount may be granted.

Demand put and carried

13. 1-Land Revenue—Temporary Establishment

Rao Sahib A. Madhava Prabhu *(Diwan Peishkar):* I rise to move for an additional allotment of Rs. 2,596 under "1-Land Revenue—Temporary Establishment".

There is only a provision of Rs. 2,000 for Survey Training in the current year's budget. The expenditure on this account in the year is estimated to be Rs. 4,596 including pay and allowances of two Tahsildars who are also to be given training as Revenue Inspectors. An additional allotment of Rs. 2,596 is therefore necessary under "1-Land Revenue—Temporary Establishment".

I request that the additional allotment may be granted.

Demand put and carried

14. 32—Scientific, etc., Depart ments—1. Museum and Zoological Gardens—Feeding Charges

Rao Sahib A. Madhava Prabhu *(Diwan Peishkar):* I rise to move for an additional allotment of Rs. 1,490 under "32—Scientific, etc. Departments—1 Museum and Zoological Gardens—Feeding Charges".

An enhanced rate of 2 annas per pound of beef, instead of 1½ annas as per contract was sanctioned to the Zoo contractor for 1120, as compensation for the loss sustained by him in the contract. The additional expenditure on account of this comes to Rs. 1,490. The compensation was granted only this year, and so provision for this could not be included in the current year's budget. Hence an additional allotment of Rs. 1,490 is required under "Feeding charges", Museum and Zoological Gardens.

I request that the additional allotment may be sanctioned.

There is a cut motion in the name of Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan to reduce the allotment by Re. 1 [to enquire (*i*) whether there was any rise in the price of beef subsequent to the date of tender and in the course of 1120; (*ii*) what was the price at time of tender and subsequent; (*iii*) when the enhanced rate was sanctioned and (*iv*) whether the compensation has been already paid and if so when ?]

The answer is (*i*) There was (*ii*) 4 annas. Afterwards it became 6 annas per lb. (*iii*) 27th November 1945. (*iv*) not paid awaiting sanction.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* Sir, I oppose this demand for the reason that, as pointed out by the Hon'ble Member representing this House in the Standing Finance Committee, the policy of paying compensation to the contractors is something which is not at all healthy. If the transaction ends in a big gain to the contractor reciprocity in th

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

shape of refunding some amount of the profit to the Government does not exist. And it is not desirable either therefore to compensate a man, who with open eyes, has entered into the contract with the Government and in the course of transaction, because of the fluctuations in the price, ultimately the transaction ends in loss, it is not good at all. If the Government is to step in and make good the loss, that will be a heavy strain on the part of the Government and an unhealthy practice which will become very bad in course of time. On this principle, I request that this House may not be pleased to grant this demand. And the change in the price or rather rise in the price referred to in the answers is not also anything which will work out an ultimate loss to the contractor. It will only be a case of anticipated or expected profits going down by a few rupees. Instead of getting Rs. 20,000 of anticipated gains he may have 16,000 rupees. Therefore to say that the contractor, who with open eyes and conversant with the conditions of the incidents of rise and fall of prices—one who entered into a transaction like that—if he is permitted to fully make good the expected or anticipated profit, it is a policy which the Government should not indulge in. And more than that, it is a policy for which the non-official section of this House, should not be a consenting party. That is the position I take Sir. I request the Hon'ble Members of the House to see eye to eye with me on this proposition and lay down for the guidance of the Government a policy which will not work to the detriment of the State. He may be a contractor of the Government who gains immensely in other fields. On no ground is there any justification for the loss being compensated? For these reasons I oppose the demand.

മിസ്റ്റർ ജോസ് കെ. വർഗീസ്: മാംസത്തിന്റെ വില നാലണയിൽനിന്ന് ആറണയായി എന്നാണ് ഗവണ്മെണ്ടു മെമ്പർ പറഞ്ഞതു്. എന്നാൽ രണ്ടുമുന്നു കൊല്ലത്തിനിപ്പുറം നാലണക്കോ ആറണക്കോ മാംസം കിട്ടാറില്ല. ബീഫ് കൊടുക്കുന്നതെന്നു പറഞ്ഞു. അതു വല്ല പട്ടിയുടെ മാംസമല്ലാതെ ബീഫായ് രിക്കയില്ല. ഒന്നരണക്കോ രണ്ടണക്കോ ഒന്നും മാസം കിട്ടുകയില്ല. അപ്പോൾ മിസ്റ്റർ എഴത്തശ്ശൻ പറഞ്ഞതു ശരിയാണ്. ഞാൻ അതിനോടു കൂടി യോജിക്കുന്നു.

Rao Sahib A. Madhava Prabhu *(Diwan Peishkar)*: The general policy is of course what has been enunciated namely that the contractor should not be paid anything more than what he has tendered for. But in this particular case a certain thing intervened for which the contractor is not responsible. And that is this: There was a regulation prohibiting the slaughter of cattle below 10 years. It came into existence after his tender was given and accepted, and so the number of cattle that was available for slaughter became very small. On this account, there was a rise in the price of beef from 4 annas to 6 annas. That was the reason why the Government thought it just to compensate him so that on account of the action of the Government he should not be put to loss. Further, I remember the price quoted by the next tender was 2 annas 2 pies when this contractor's tender was 1 anna 6 pies. The claim that he put forward was Rs. 3,200 for 5 months but we have given him only Rs. 1,400 for the whole year It is practically very little compared with the actual loss on account of the high price and due to the action of the Government intervening by prohibiting by a regulation the slaughter of cattle below 10 years. I submit that we accept the general principle, but in this particular case the excess is necessitated by special considerations.

മിസ്റ്റർ സി. എസ്സ്. പണിക്കർ: ഈ നിയമം വന്നപ്പോൾ കൺട്രാക്ടറെ ഒഴിവാക്കി അതുണ്ടെന്നു പറഞ്ഞു വല്ല പൊറീഷനും ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നോ?

Rao Sahib A. Madhava Prabhu *(Diwan Peishkar)*: In this particular petition of his that prayer was also made. The claim was very much higher. It was difficult to get anything for this price and so we thought to give him compensation and ask him to supply. The Government would have lost much more if Government had taken up the supply.

Demand put and carried

15. 21—Education—Collegiate Education—T. A.

Rao Sahib I. N. Menon *(Director of Public Instruction)*: I rise to move for an additional allotment of Rs. 270 under "21 Education—Collegiate Education T. A."

The Public Analyst was deputed for a period of one month to study in detail the system obtaining in Bombay in regard to the sampling of rationed food-grains in the Municipal laboratories maintained by the Bombay Municipality. He has to be paid travelling allowance

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly